DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 454 CS 502 102

AUTHOR Nelson, Audrey A.
TITLE Sex and Proxemics: An Annotated Bibliography.
PUB DATE Feb 78
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Annotated Bibliographies; Body Image; *Body Language; *Kinesthetic Perception; Nonverbal Communication; *Proximity; *Sex Differences; *Space Orientation
IDENTIFIERS *Proxemics

ABSTRACT

This annotated bibliography focuses on the sex differences and similarities in two proxemic variables, physical distance and orientation of the body. The majority of the more than 90 titles, dating from 1965 to the present, are selected from the following sources: dissertation abstracts, social-psychology journals, communication journals, and unpublished papers. Tests that emphasize sex differences in proxemics are also cited. (MAI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED154454

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SEX AND PROXEMICS: AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Audrey A. Nelson
University of Colorado, Boulder
Department of Communication

February 1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Audrey A. Nelson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CSS02102

Sex and Proxemics: An Annotated Bibliography

Purpose, Scope, and Criteria for Selection. It was twenty years ago that Edward T. Hall wrote, "We treat space somewhat as we treat sex. It is there but we don't talk about it" (p. 147). Interest and research in proxemics, the way people use and structure space, has increased greatly during the last two decades. The role of culture, personality traits, situational factors, invasion and status have all been central to the study of proxemics. Another major variable that is known to affect proxemics is sex. Much empirical and theoretical consideration has been given to this variable in adult and children's behavior, and there is a need for a bibliography on the literature.

The focus of this bibliography is the sex differences and/or similarities in two proxemic variables: physical distance (variously called "body buffer zone" and "personal space") and orientation of the body. This bibliography does not include titles on other proxemic variables such as eye-contact and touch.

The bibliography contains citations from dissertation abstracts, social-psychology journals, communication journals and some unpublished papers. Tests that offered emphasis on sex differences in proxemics were also cited. The majority of titles range from 1965 to present.

To collect the titles in this bibliography, the following methods were employed: (1) a survey of communication journals from 1934 to present, (2) a computer search of psychological abstracts, (3) investigations of new books (e.g., Nonverbal Behavior and Communication, eds.

A. W. Siegman and S. Feldstein (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1978) and journals (e.g., Environmental Psychology and Nonverbal Behavior and Sex Roles), and a private reference list of a few researchers in the field.

Addis, B. R. "The Relationship of Physical Interpersonal Distance to Sex, Race, and Age." M.A. Thesis Univ. of Oklahoma, 1966.

The greatest interacting distance was between males.

Adler, L., and Graubert, J. "Projected Social Distances from Mental Patient Related Items by Male and Female Volunteers and Non-volunteers." Psychological Reports, 37(2) (October 1975), 515-521.

In a projective measure, male nonvolunteers placed themselves significantly farther than females from stimuli associated with retardation. Items of a "negative-affect" elicited greater projected distances than did the responses to positive or neutral-affect for males.

Aiello, J. R. "Visual Interaction at Extended Distances." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 3(1) (Winter 1977), 83-86.

Males increased their looking at larger distances and females decreased their level of visual regard over the course of the conversation. Upper distance boundary for female visual responsiveness was reached between 7 degrees and 9.5 degrees. For males, visual responsiveness was not reached by 14.5 degrees.

Aiello, J. R., and Jones, S. E. "Field Study of the Proxemic Behavior of Young School Children in Three Subcultural Groups." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 19(1) (1971), 351-356.

White males maintained greater distances than white females. There were no sex differences in the distance employed by blacks and Puerto-Ricans. Females were less direct than males in shoulder orientation.

Aiello, J. R., and Aiello, T. "The Development of Personal Space: Proxemic Behavior of Children 6 Through 16." Human Ecology, 2(3) (1974), 177-189.

By early adolescence, males were found to stand at greater distances and angles than females.

Allgeier, A., and Eyrne, D. "Attraction Toward the Opposite Sex as a Determinant of Physical Proximity." Journal of Social Psychology, 90(2) (Aug. 1973), 213-19.

There was a significant relationship between attitude similarity and seating distance for both sexes: both males and females placed themselves closer to a liked than to a disliked member of the opposite sex.

Apanatis, B. "The Use of Personal Space by Black and White Sixth Grade Children." Dissertation Abstracts International, 34 (March 1974), 9-A, Part 1, pp. 5702-5703.

No significant sex differences were found in the use of personal space by black and white sixth grade children.

Argle, M., and Dean, J. "Eye-contact, Distance and Affiliation." Sociometry, 28 (1965), 289-304.

The greatest interacting distance was between opposite-sex pairs. Female pairs tended to interact at closer range than did male pairs.

Baron, R., and Bel, P. "Physical Distance and Helping: Some Unexpected Benefits of Crowding." Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 6(2) (April-June, 1976), 95-104.

There were no sex differences in the invasion of personal space.

Barrios, B.; Corbitt, C.; Estes, J.; Topping, J. "Effect of a Social Stigma on Interpersonal Distance." Psychological Record, 26(3) (Summer 1976), 343-348.

Both females and males sat closer to a nonstigmatized than a stigmatized (bisexual) confederate, and closer to a female confederate than to a male confederate.

Bass, M., and Weinstein. "Early Development of Interpersonal Distance in Children." Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 3(4) (1971), 368-376.

There were no significant sex differences in interpersonal space among kindergarten, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd graders. Males had a greater mean spatial distance for both "friends" and "strangers" in all situations, except in the 1st grade.

Bauer, E. "Personal Space: A Study of Blacks and Whites." Sociometry, 36(3) (September 1973), 402-408.

No significant differences were found for sex and the interaction of sex and race. White males were most distant and black females were most proximal.

Baxter, J. C. "Interpersonal Spacing in Natural Settings." Sociometry, 33(4) (1970), 444-456.

Male-female groups interacted most proximally and male-male groups were most distant. Female-female groups were intermediate.

Beach, D., and Sokoloff, M. "Spatially Dominated Nonverbal Communication of Children: A Methodological Study." Perceptual and Motor Skills, 38 (3, Part 2) (June 1974), 1303-1310.

Girls employed greater distances than did boys in same-sex triads (ages 4 and 5).

Beck, S., and Ollendick, T. "Personal Space, Sex of Experimenter, and Locus of Control in Normal and Delinquent Adolescents." Psychological Reports, 38(2) (April 1976), 383-387.

Both "normal" and "delinquent" males allowed female experimenters to approach closer than male experimenters.

Boggs, M. "Relationship Definition: The Influence of Selected Physical and Social Contexts on Interpersonal Distance." Dissertation Abstracts International, 36 (July 1975), 1-B, p. 489.

Female mean distance scores were significantly smaller than those of males. Sex differences in interpersonal space were found in four situations.

Buchanan, D.; Juhnke, R.; and Goldman, M. "Violation of Personal Space as a Function of Sex." Journal of Social Psychology, 99(2) (August 1976), 187-192.

Both males and females significantly avoided personal space violations of an elevator selection panel occupied by a male. Females were less prone to avoid spatial violation of a female confederate. In a second situation, both panels were occupied at the same time. A male confederate occupied one panel and a female occupied the other panel. Males chose to violate female space and females showed no significant preference.

Cook, M. "Experiments on Orientation and Proxemics." Human Relations, 23(1) (1970), 61-76.

The seating preferences for a bar or "Public House" were corner seating for same-sexed friends and casual friends of the opposite sex. In the context of a restaurant, all variations of sex and acquaintance selected opposite seating.

Cornelius, S., and Denney, N. "Dependency in Day-Care and Home-Care Children." Developmental Psychology, 11(5) (September 1975), 575-582.

Home-care girls sought proximity toward their mother significantly more than home-care boys. There was no difference between day-care girls and day-care boys.

Dick, W. "Invasion of Personal Space as a Function of Age and of Race." Psychological Report, 39(1) (August 1976), 281-282.

Females were more cautious about invading the personal space of both white and black confederates (ages: 20 and 30 years).

Dosey, M. A., and Meisels, M. "Personal Space and Self Protection." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 11(2) (1969), 93-97.

During conditions of stress, females approached closer to a subject of the same sex and staved farther apart from the opposite sex.

Edwards, D. J. "Perception of Crowding and Personal Space as a Function of Locus of Control, Arousal Seeking, Sex of Experimenter, and Sex of Subject." Journal of Psychology, 95(2) (March 1977), 223-229.

Distances were larger with a female experimenter than with a male experimenter. Arousal-seeking tendency (AST) scores were larger for females than for male subjects.

Evans, G. W., and Howard, R. B. "Personal Space." Psychological Bulletin, 80 (1973), 334-44.

This is a review of personal space literature with a brief section on sex differences. The major conclusion drawn was that "male-female pairs require less personal space than female-female pairs who in turn require less than male-male dyads."

Feigenbaum, W. "Reciprocity in Self-Disclosure within the Psychological Interview." Psychological Reports, 40(1) (Feb. 1977), 15-26.

Sex of subject and seating arrangement did not differ significantly with the intimacy of self-disclosure.

Fleming, G. "A Comparative Analysis of Dyadic Spatial Interaction Varying Race and Sex." Dissertation Abstracts International, 36 (March 1976), 9-B, pp. 4753-4754.

Black males permitted black experimenters, irrespective of sex, to approach closer than whites.

Ford, J. "The Effects of Attitude and Personality Similarity-Dissimilarity and Group Deviancy-Nondeviancy on Personal Space." Dissertation Abstracts International, 35 (July 1974), 1-b, pp. 539-540.

Females' "dissimilarity" significantly increased personal space relative to the similarity and control conditions, only in relation to female confederates. All three condition groups did not differ significantly with male confederates.

Fromme, D., and Bean, D. "Dominance and Sex Differences in Nonverbal Responses to Differential Eye-Contact." Journal of Research in Personality, 8(1) (June 1974), 76-87.

In signalling dominance, females employed reciprocal eye-contact, while males used personal space and approach rate.

Giesen, M. "Physical Distance and Sex in Moderated Groups: Neglected Factors in Small Group Interaction." Memory and Cognition, 5(1) (January 1977), 79-83.

Regardless of sex, group members sat closer to a female moderator than to a male moderator.

Giesen, M., and McClaren, H. "Discussion, Distance and Sex: Changes in Impressions and Attraction During Small Group Interaction." Sociometry, 39(1) (March 1976), 60-70.

Females chose closer seating among themselves, and subjects sat closer to a female moderator than to a male moderator. Females' "attentiveness" and "positive feeling" decreased as distance in seating arrangement increased. Males displayed an opposite tendency.

Guardo, C. J. "Personal Space, Sex Differences, and Interpersonal Attraction." Journal of Psychology, 92 (1976), 9-14.

Sixth grade girls' personal space schemata revealed a tendency to use greater distance with "phlegmatic" peers and were drawn closest to "tender-minded" peers. Sixth grade boys were attracted to "vigorous" peers and were distant with "apprehensive and emotionally labile peers."

Guardo, C., and Meisels, M. "Factor Structure of Children's Personal Space Schemata." Child Development, 42 (1971), 1307-1313.

Girls' personal space schemata did not change with age and became more highly schematized for older girls. These spatial patterns were more influenced by the "emotional tone" of the interaction than the sex of the stimulus figure. Boys' development of personal space was consistent across age and it was based on the stimulus figure's sex.

Hamid, P. "Actual and Schematic Interaction Distances in Children." New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 9(2) (November 1974), 127-133.

Males (5-11 years old) showed increasing schematic and actual distancing from a female peer. Schematic placement distance was similar to that of actual social interaction distances, particularly for males.

Hartnett, J.; Bailey, K.; and Hartley, C. "Body Height, Position, and Sex as Determinants of Personal Space." Journal of Psychology, 87(1) (May 1974), 129-136.

Both males and females employed twice as much distance between themselves and the "tall object person" than between themselves and the "short object person."

Hartnett, J.; Bailey, K. G.; Gibson, F. W. "Personal Space as Influenced by Sex and Type of Movement." Journal of Psychology, 76 (1970), 139-144.

Females allowed greater spatial invasions by both male and female experimenters than did males.

Hendrick, C.; Giesen, M.; and Coy, S. "The Social Eulogy of Free Seating Arrangements in a Small Group Interaction Context." Sociometry, 37(2) (June 1974), 262-274.

In a "free seating situation," distances were slightly greater among males and confederates than among females in Experiment II. These results were not consistent with the first experiment which revealed no significant sex differences.

Hendricks, M. "Race and Sex as Stimuli for Negative Affect and Physical Avoidance." Journal of Social Psychology, 98(1) (February 1976), 111-120.

Male confederates reported discomfort sooner and to a greater degree when approached than did females.

Heshka, S., and Nelson, Y. "Interpersonal Speaking Distance as a Function of Age, Sex, and Relationship." Sociometry, 35(4) (December 1972), 491-498.

Female strangers were more distant than male strangers. Speaking distance varied according to relationship except in male-male dyads.

Horrowitz, M. J.; Duff, D. F.; and Stratton, C. O. "Body Buffer Zones." Archives of General Psychiatry, 11 (1964), 651-656.

Both schizophrenic and non-schizophrenic males and females did not significantly differ in their approaches to other males or females. Both groups approached inanimate objects closer than they approached males or females.

Jones, S. "A Comparative Proxemic Analysis of Dyadic Interaction in Selected Subcultures of N. Y. City." Journal of Social Psychology, 84 (1971), 35-44.

Female-female dyads were more direct in shoulder orientation than male-male dyads in the Black and Chinese subcultures. Male-female mean scores of shoulder orientation were between the male-male and female-female means among four subcultures: Italian, Blacks, and Puerto-Rican, and Chinese.

Jones, S., and Aiello, J. "Proxemic Behavior of Black and White First-, Third-, and Fifth-Grade Children." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25(1) (1973), 21-27.

Both black males and white males were less direct in shoulder orientation than females. This behavior was most pronounced in the fifth grade. Black females were closest in distance and white females were most distant. Both white males and black males were intermediate.

Kagan, J. "The Emergence of Sex Differences." School Review, 80(2) (1972), 217-297.

An explanation of the development of a female's "withdrawal" behavior in response to fear is offered.

Kaschak, E. "Non-verbal Communication in Family Triads as a Function of the Sex of the Child." Dissertation Abstracts International, 35 (November 1974), 5-B, p. 2434.

Females did not sit closer to their mothers than did males to their fathers. Mothers and daughters made more use of a side-by-side position than mother-father, father-son, father-daughter, or mother-son pairs. Both male and female children did not orient themselves toward the same-sex parent during the negative discussion theme.

Knapp, M. Nonverbal Communication in Human Interaction. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1972.

Research dealing with "Sex and Acquaintance" is presented on pages 50-53. The focus of this section is on research conducted by Sommer (1965) and Cook (1970). Very brief.

Knowles, E. "Boundaries Around Social Space: Dyadic Responses to an Invader." Environment and Behavior, 4(4) (December 1972), 437-445.

Cross-sex dyads avoided penetration of an experimenter by moving the social unit more than did male-male dyads.

Krail, K., and Leventhal, G. "The Sex Variable in the Intrusion of Personal Space." Sociometry, 39 (1976), 170-173.

There were no sex differences in the "compensatory actions" of subjects being invaded personally by other people. Same-sex dyads showed a shorter latency of response than heterosexual dyads. Female subjects were "less tolerant" of a male invader than a male subject was of a female invader. Male invaders elicited a shorter latency of response than the female invaders in all cases. Females'

latency of response was higher than males' when the invader was seated across from the subject. When the invader was seated closest to the subject, females' latency of response was lower than males'.

Lerner, R.; Venning, J.; and Knapp, J. "Age and Sex Effects on Personal Space Schemata Toward Body Build in Late Childhood." Developmental Psychology, 11(6) (November 1975), 855-856.

Data comparing kindergarten through 6th grade children revealed that the relative relations between the sex and body type of a target and the interpersonal distance employed remained stable for both sexes.

Lerner, R.; Karabenick, S.; and Meisels, M. "Effects of Age and Sex on the Development of Personal Space Schemata Towards Body Build." Journal of Genetic Psychology, 127(1) (September 1975), 81-101.

Children from kindergarten through 3rd grade projected greater distances towards female stimuli. Closer distances were projected toward same-sex stimuli than to opposite-sex stimuli. These sex differences were greater at higher grade levels.

Liebman, M. "The Effects of Sex and Race Norms on Personal Space." Environment and Behavior, 2 (1970), 208-246.

Subjects sat closer to females than to males and chose female intruders over male intruders.

Lomranz, J.; Shapira, A.; Choresh, N.; and Gilat, V. "Children's Personal Space as a Function of Age and Sex." Developmental Psychology, 11(15) (September 1975) 541-545.

Children (ages 3, 5, and 7) employed less distance when interacting with girls than with boys.

Mahoney, E. "Compensatory Reactions to Spatial Intermediacy." Sociometry, 37(3) (September 1974), 423-431.

Females in an "invasion condition" decreased "compensatory" reactions. Female invaders had more effect on females than males.

Markey, M. "The Ontogenesis of Proxemic Behavior among School-Aged Children." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1971.

There were no significant sex differences or sex interactions in the development of children's proxemic behavior. Both girls and boys placed simulated figures similarly.

McCroskey, J.; Richmond, V.; and Young, T. "Interpersonal Space Preferences as a Function of Sex and Communication Apprehension." Paper presented at the Eastern Communication Association, New York, March 1977.

A female's level of communication apprehension does not mediate her interpersonal distance. The reverse pattern existed for males.

McDowell, K. "Violations of Personal Space." Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 4(3) (July 1972), 210-217.

A violation of personal space by a "stranger" elicited a significant movement away from the violator, regardless of sex.

Mehrabian, A., and Friar, J. "Encoding of Attitude by a Seated Communicator via Posture and Position Cues." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33 (1969), 330-336.

Females allowed closer approaches to themselves than did males.

Meisels, M., and Guardo, C. "Development of Personal Space Schemata." Child Development, 40 (1969), 1167-1178.

Females used greater distance in all neutral and negative-affect conditions except "acquaintance." Males used more distance in one positive-affect condition: "friend." For "dislike," "fear," and "group fear," females employed more space than males across most grade-levels (3rd through 10th), regardless of the composition of the dyads.

Melson, G. "Determinants of Personal Space in Young Children: Perception of Distance Cues." Perceptual and Motor Skills, 43(1) (August 1976), 107-114.

Females 3 to 6 years old used sex of figures as a social cue in depicting appropriate distances.

Mortiea, T. "An Analysis of the Proxemic Behavior of Community College Staff and Students According to Sex, Academic Goal, Job Responsibility, and Dogmatism Levels." Dissertation Abstracts International, 35 (April 1975), 10-A, p. 6464.

Significant sex differences in the proxemic preferences for seating arrangements during interview situations were found among community college students.

Naus, D., and Eckenrode. "Age Differences and Degree of Acquaintance as Determinants of Interpersonal Distance." Journal of Social Psychology, 93(1) (June 1974), 133-134.

The main effects of degree of acquaintance and sex were not significant determinants of interpersonal distance.

Nelson, A. "Developmental Trends in the Sex Differences of Proxemic Behavior." Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, Phoenix, Arizona, November 1977.

A consistent pattern of sex differences between female-female and male-male dyads did not emerge until the 6th and 7th grades. Heterosexual dyads employed greater distances and maintained a less direct shoulder orientation than same-sex dyads.

Nesbitt, P., and Girard, S. "Personal Space and Stimulus Intensity at a Southern California Amusement Park." Sociometry, 37(1) (March 1974), 105-115.

Subjects stood closer to a female model than to a male model. Male subjects approached the female model more closely than did the female subjects.

Nogami, G. "Crowding: Effects of Group Size, Room Size, or Density." Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 6(2) (April-June 1976), 105-125.

Females were more density oriented than males.

Patterson, M. "The Role of Space in Social Interaction." Nonverbal Behavior and Communication. Eds. Aron S. Siegman and Stanley Feldstein. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1978. 265-290.

A current overview of research dealing with sex differences in proxemic behavior is offered (pages 270-272). Suggestions for future research and a summary of findings are discussed.

Pederson, D. M. "Developmental Trends in Personal Space." Journal of Psychology, 82 (1973), 3-9.

Males in grades one through six had a larger personal space than females. A consistent "downward trend" in personal space for females reversed itself in the sixth grade. Specifically, sixth grade females had approximately the same distance as sixth grade males.

Pedersen, D., and Heaston, A. "The Effects of Sex of Subject, Sex of Approaching Person, and Angle of Approach upon Personal Space." Journal of Psychology, 2(2) (November 1972), 276-286.

Using a simulated technique, both males and females positioned females closer than males. There were no differences in the distance that males and females positioned males. Males permitted others to approach closer frontally than did females. Females allowed others to approach closer at the sides.

Pellegrini, R. J., and Emply, J. "Interpersonal Spatial Orientation on Dyads." Journal of Psychology, 76(1) (1970), 67-70.

Females sat significantly closer to female interviewers than did males to male interviewers. Females exhibited displacement away from a direct (face-to-face) orientation significantly more than males.

Petri, H.; Huggins, R.; Mi[illegible] C.; Barry, L. "Variables Influencing the Shape of Personal Space." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1(1) (1974), 360-361.

Sex of an approaching stranger significantly influenced personal space for both males and females.

Post, B., and Hetherington, E. "Sex Differences in the Use of Proximity and Eye-Contact in Judgments of Affiliation in Preschool Children." Developmental Psychology 10(6) (November 1974), 881-889.

Both 4-year-old girls and boys employed proximity cues in judging liking and only girls demonstrated an increase in the accuracy of use of this cue by age 6. In a second study designed to train subjects in the use of proximity cues, only 4-year-old girls improved their skills.

Powell, P., and Dabbs, J. "Physical Attractiveness and Personal Space." Journal of Social Psychology, 100(1) (October 1976), 56-64.

In a laboratory situation, females approached attractive targets of either sex more closely than unattractive ones. Males approached attractive females more closely than unattractive ones. In an interview conducted on a sidewalk, there were no sex differences.

Price, G., and Dabbs, J. "Sex Setting and Personal Space: Changes as Children Grow Older." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1(1)(1974), 362-363.

Both males and females had similar personal space preferences until the age of puberty. At this ages, both sexes began to "approximate adult distance patterns."

Quick, Alida. "The Effects of Sex and Anxiety in the Invasion of Personal Space." Dissertation Abstracts International, 36 (September 1975), 3-B, p. 1512.

Females were more anxious than males when invading personal space. Female invaders did not evoke more invadee threat to subjects.

Rinkoff, R. "The Effects of Distance of Mother and a Stranger on Attachment and Stranger-Exploration Behavior in Ten-Month-Old Infants." Dissertation Abstracts International, 35 (May 1975), 11-B, p. 5625.

Sex and distance of stranger did not affect behavior. Distance of mother affected latency and duration of fussing and duration of play.

Rosegrant, T., and McCroskey, J. "The Effects of Race and Sex on Proxemic Behavior in an Interview Setting." Southern States Speech Journal, 40(4) (1975), 408-420.

Black females were most proximal in interview situations. Male-male dyads maintained greater distances than other dyads.

Rubinstein, Emily. "Body Buffer Zones in Female Prisoners." Dissertation Abstracts International, 36 (September 1975), 3-B, pp. 1456-1457.

Female prisoners had significantly smaller body-buffer zones than male prisoners. Sex of the experimenter had minimal effects on female body-buffer zone.

Russo, N. "Eye-Contact, Interpersonal Distance, and the Equilibrium Theory." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31(3) (March 1975), 497-502.

The percentage of time engaged in eye-contact increased with distance and was higher for females than males (same-sex dyads).

Shutter, R. "A Field Study of Nonverbal Communication in Germany, Italy, and the United States." Communication Monographs, 44(4) (November 1977), 298-305.

American male dyads interacted with a significantly less direct axis (shoulder orientation) than did female or heterosexual dyads. American males interacted significantly farther apart than did female or heterosexual dyads.

Simmons, J. "Personal Space and Approach Distance as a Function of Sex Differences and Personality Variables." Dissertation Abstracts International, 34 (February 1974), 8-B, p. 4028.

Females sat significantly closer to the male experimenter than did males. Seating positions were significantly different between males and females.

Skeen, D. "Influence of Interpersonal Distance in Serial Learning." Psychological Reports, 39(2) (October 1976), 579-582.

The reduction of a male experimenter's distance had no significant sex effect on the acquisition of a serial learning task.

Skotko, V. "Conversational Intimacy and Interpersonal Attraction as a Function of the Manipulation of Interaction Distance." Dissertation Abstracts International, 35 (February 1975), 8-B, p. 4260.

Males increased intimacy as distance increased in all measures but that of information statements. Females decreased intimacy with increasing distance.

Skotko, V., and Langmyer, D. "The Effects of Interaction Distance and Gender are Self-Disclosure in the Dyad." Sociometry, 40(2) (1977), 178-182.

Judges' ratings of intimacy revealed that females demonstrated greater intimacy than males for shorter distances (2 and 4 feet) and less intimacy at greater distances (10 feet). Females decreased "affective statements" as distance increased (4 and 10 feet), whereas males increased affective statements as distance increased.

Sobel, R., and Lillith, N. "Determinants of Nonstationary Personal-Space Pedestrians." Journal of Social Psychology, 97(1) (October 1975), 39-45.

Male experimenters were given less frontal space than female experimenters. Male experimenters were "brushed" more than female experimenters.

Sommer, R. "Studies in Personal Space." Sociometry, 22 (1959), 247-260.

In a task situation, females sat at right angles and males sat opposite each other. Females sat closer than males.

Spielman, R. "Identity and Interpersonal Distance." Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, (1973), 1-A, pp. 416-417.

Children from predominantly welfare-supported families responded significantly in interpersonal distance to different sex and different race "target dolls."

Stern, D. N., and Bender, E. P. "An Ethological Study of Children Approaching a Strange Adult: Sex Differences." Sex Differences in Behavior. Eds. R. C. Friedman, R. M. Richart, and R. L. Van de Wiele. New York: Wiley, 1974.

Stratton, L.; Tekippe, D.; and Flick, G. "Personal Space and Self-Concept." Sociometry, 36(3) (September 1974), 424-429.

Females with a high self-concept (HSC) approached an experimenter more closely than did (HSC) males. Females with a low self-concept were more distant than LSC males.

Tennis, G., and Dabbs, J. "Sex, Setting and Personal Space: First Grade through College." Sociometry, 38(3) (September 1975), 385-394.

Interpersonal distance preferences (IDP) were greater among males than among females. Sex differences in IDP were more pronounced among older subjects than younger subjects.

Tipton, R.; Baily, K.; and Obenchain. "Invasion of Males' Personal Space by Feminists and Non-Feminists." Psychological Reports, 37(1) (August 1975), 99-102.

Both feminists and traditional women approached other females similarly. Traditional women maintained greater distances from males than did feminists.

Veno, A. E. "Proxemic Components of Agonistic Behavior in Adult Humans: A Field Study." Dissertation Abstracts International, 35 (November 1974), 5-B, p. 2487.

Male and female subjects were frontally approached by a twenty-five-year old, "medium-tall" confederate until one of the following responses were emitted: "Aggressive" (e.g., "inflated posture" and "staring"), (2) "submissive" (e.g., "flight" and "smiling"). For males, the results revealed that bigger and same size males were more likely to use aggressive behavior to stop the approacher, as were younger and middle age males. Smaller males and older males were more likely to display submissive behavior to stop the approacher. Only smaller females' responses and distance scores were tested against smaller males' scores. The results revealed that smaller males stopped the approacher at a farther distance than smaller females.

Walker, J., and Borden, R. "Sex, Status, and the Invasion of Shared Space." Representative Research in Social Psychology, 7(1) (1976), 28-34.

Mixed-sex interacting dyads were less capable of resisting intruders than either female-female or male-male dyads. Males and females were equally likely to invade ongoing interactions. In another experiment combined effect of members' sex and status were examined. In low status ("freaky") dyads, most subjects invaded mixed-sex dyads. In high status ("straight") dyads, subjects made the fewest invasions with male-male dyads, followed by male-female, and finally the female-female dyads.

White, M. "Interpersonal Distance as Affected by Room Size, Status, and Sex." Journal of Social Psychology, 95(2) (April 1975), 241-249.

Sex did not consistently affect interpersonal distance.

Willis, F. N. "Initial Speaking Distance as a Function of the Speaker's Relationship." Psychonomic Science, 5 (1966), 221-222.

Standing speaking distance of people in a variety of contexts revealed that speakers stood closer to females than males.

Wood, B. S. Children and Communication: Verbal and Nonverbal Language Development. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.

A brief summary of sex differences in children's proxemic behavior is presented in Chapter 11, pgs. 239 to 242. Special emphasis is on developmental aspects of female and male proxemic behavior. Specifically, a Piagetian framework is offered.